

HONORING UAW LOCAL 599
REUTHER AWARD RECIPIENTS

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 4, 1999

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay tribute to 23 members of UAW Local 599, who will be recipients of the Walter P. Reuther Distinguished Service Award. On Saturday, November 6, 1999, these individuals will be honored at the 19th Annual Walter and May Reuther Twenty Year Award Banquet.

Local 599 has always had a special place in my heart because my father was one of its original members. Over the years, Local 599 has developed a strong and proud tradition of supporting the rights of working people in our community, and improving the quality of life for its membership. This year marked the 60th anniversary of the local's charter, and its commitment to working for decent wages, education and training, and civil and human rights.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honor to recognize these special individuals who, have diligently served their union and community. During this time, each one of these UAW members have held various elected positions in the union. And there is no question they have represented their brothers and sisters well.

It is very fitting that these 23 people be recipients of the Walter P. Reuther Distinguished Service Award. Walter Reuther was a man who believed in helping working people, and he believed in human dignity and social justice for all Americans. The recipients of this award have committed themselves to the ideals and principles of Walter Reuther. They are outstanding men and women who come from every part of our community, and they share the common bond of unwavering commitment and service.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in honoring Robert Aidif, David Aiken, Dennis Carl, Russell W. Cook, Harvey DeGroot, Patrick Dolan, Larry Farlin, Maurice Felling, Ted Henderson, James Yaklin, Ken Mead, Don Wilson, Frank Molina, Shirley Prater, Gene Ridley, John D. Rogers, Dale Scanlon, G. Jean Garza-Smith, Nick Vuckovich, Jerry J. Ward, Greg Wheeler, Tom Worden, and Dale Bingley. I want to congratulate these fine people for all of the work they have done to make our community a better place to live.

TRIBUTE TO AMBASSADOR VICTOR
MARRERO

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 4, 1999

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Ambassador Victor Marrero, an outstanding individual who on October 1 was unanimously confirmed by the Senate to fill a vacancy on the federal bench in New York's Southern District.

Ambassador Marrero was born in Puerto Rico and moved to New York City with his parents when he was 10. He graduated from New York University (B.A. cum laude, with Honors in History, Phi Beta Kappa). He re-

ceived his law degree from the Yale Law School, where he was elected Editor of the Yale Law Journal. He was a Fulbright Scholar at the University of Sheffield (U.K.) School of Law and has taught as a Visiting Lecturer in Law at Yale and Columbia Law Schools.

Mr. Speaker, before his confirmation to the bench, Ambassador Marrero served as the Permanent Representative of the United States to the Organization of American States. His achievements during his tenure at the OAS are impressive. Among his proposals that have been adopted are the restructuring of the General Assembly in order to streamline the number of days and make it more efficient and effective, reform to eliminate duplication and waste through a new Inter-American Agency for Cooperation and Development, and creation of the Center for the Study of Justice in the Americas. Through Attorney General Janet Reno he has pledged \$1,000,000 for the Center, to promote research on legal matters, train personnel, exchange information, and provide technical support on the reform processes of judicial systems in the Americas.

Mr. Speaker, before this posting, Ambassador Marrero served since 1993 as the United States Representative on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. He brought to his diplomatic posts extensive experience in private law practice and business in New York as well as public service in federal, state and city government.

Prior to his service at the United Nations, Ambassador Marrero practiced law in New York City. As a partner in the Manhattan law firm of Brown and Wood, he specialized in real estate, land use, development and environmental law.

During the Carter Administration, Ambassador Marrero was Under Secretary of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Previously he had been Commissioner of the New York State Division of Housing and Community Renewal and the Vice Chairman of the New York State Housing Finance Agency. Before joining state government, he served as Chairman of the City Planning Commission of New York City.

Mr. Speaker, Ambassador Marrero has served as Director or Trustee for numerous civic education, charitable and professional organizations, as well as the Mayor of New York's Management Advisory Committee and Commission on the homeless, and the Yale University Urban Advisory Committee.

Ambassador Marrero is married to Veronica M. White. They have two children, Andrew and Robert.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Ambassador Victor Marrero for his accomplishments as the Permanent Representative of the United States to the Organization of American States and in wishing him success as a Federal Judge in Manhattan.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COLLEGE
ACCESS ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. ROBERT L. EHRLICH, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 1, 1999

Mr. EHRLICH. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 974, the District of Columbia College

Access Act. It is legislation long overdue and deserves an immediate Presidential signature. This legislation expands the educational choices and opportunities of eligible District of Columbia students by establishing a program that permits these graduates to pay in-state tuition rates upon admission to state colleges in Maryland or Virginia. Moreover, this will benefit the already first-rate educational opportunities in these states by increasing the number and quality of candidates for admission.

Unlike the 50 states, the university system in the District of Columbia is significantly limited. The University of the District of Columbia is the city's only public university. Thus, if high school graduates from the District's schools want to attend an institution of higher learning and pay-in-state tuition they have no choice except the District's university. This is unacceptable.

H.R. 974 levels the playing field. It provides eligible high school graduates from the District's schools a network of state-supported colleges to attend. Specifically, this legislation establishes a program to permit D.C. residents who are recent high school graduates the ability to pay in-state tuition rates upon admission to state colleges in Maryland or Virginia. Under this proposal, the federal government will pay the difference between the two rates, creating no additional cost to state universities. Public university grants may not exceed \$10,000 in any award year, with a total cap of \$50,000 per individual.

Additionally, this legislation provides tuition assistance grants of \$2,500 for students attending private colleges in the District or the adjoining Maryland and Virginia suburbs, including historically black colleges and universities as another educational option for the District's students.

Access to quality education in the United States is essential. This bill goes a long way to ensure that the students of the District of Columbia are afforded a variety of educational opportunities at a reasonable cost. It will encourage the young people of the District of Columbia to complete high school and seek further education. This will enable them to acquire better jobs in the future, earn good salaries, and improve the quality of life in the entire Washington, D.C. metropolitan region.

COUNCIL OF KHALISTAN LETTER
IN NEW YORK POST ALLEGES
RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION IN
INDIA

HON. JOHN T. DOOLITTLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 4, 1999

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a letter that appeared on Wednesday, November 3, 1999, in the New York Post by Dr. Gurmit Singh Aulakh, President of the Council of Khalistan. It reveals the religious persecution in India.

Christians have been actively persecuted in India in recent months, a pattern carried out on Sikhs, Muslims, and others.

I urge all my colleagues to read the attached letter, which I am placing in the RECORD.

[From the New York Post, Nov. 3, 1999]

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION IN INDIA

Thank you, Rod Dreher, for an excellent article ("Pope's passage to India may be most perilous yet," Oct. 28) exposing the "Hindu brownshirts" who run India.

The religious persecution of Christians has reached unparalleled proportions, as Dreher aptly points out. But it is not just Christians who have suffered severe religious persecution. India has killed over 200,000 Christians, over 250,000 Sikhs, more than 65,000 Muslims and tens of thousands of Assamese, Manipuris, Tamils, Dalits and others since its independence. Thousands of minorities, especially Sikhs, remain in Indian jails as political prisoners without charge or trial.

The Western world must not accept this pattern of religious tyranny.

DR. GURMIT SINGH AULAKH,
Council of Khalistan,
Washington D.C. (via e-mail).

REPUBLICANS ARE WINNING THE BUDGET FIGHT

HON. ERNEST J. ISTOOK, JR.

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 4, 1999

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the Republicans in the House and the Senate on our pledge not to spend Social Security. To that end, I recommend the reading of the following article by Tod Lindberg, which appeared in the November 8th issue of *The Weekly Standard*.

HOUSE REPUBLICANS ARE WINNING ONE THE BUDGET BATTLE OF 1999, HARD TO BELIEVE BUT TRUE, HAS FEATURED GOP CUNNING
(By Tod Lindberg)

Republicans both inside and outside Congress have been pleasantly surprised by how well they are doing politically in this year's budget fight with President Clinton. Ever since Clinton squashed the Republican Congress over the government shutdown in 1995-96, the autumnal rites of appropriation have been a time of dread for the GOP, an exercise in wondering who among them will be a human sacrifice come the next election as a result of drawing the wrath of the Democratic administration.

This time, simply put, they are not getting killed. In fact, thanks to their tireless reiteration of their unifying theme—namely, that they are going to protect every last dime of Social Security from marauding Democrats—and thanks to the money the GOP is spending on advertising in select congressional districts repeating the point, poll numbers show the Republican message taking hold. It looks like Republicans have at last found an incantation with the same black magic power as the Democrats' "Medicare, Medicaid, education, and the environment."

Now, there are those who might say that the real secret of the GOP's success, such as it is, has been timely surrender, appeasement, and subterfuge: that Republicans have wholeheartedly agreed to substantial increases in government spending. The spending caps theoretically imposed by the balanced budget agreement have in effect been blown to smithereens, and the appropriations bills themselves are, in the aggregate, full of budgetary gimmickry and self-aggrandizing assumptioneering. This, snort some, is what a Republican Congress does? Crank up spending and cook the books to hide it?

Well, up to a point. Those who see a smaller, more limited federal government as the sole test of conservative success will rightly be disappointed. At the end of the appropriations process—which is to say, before final negotiations with the White House—domestic discretionary outlays were scheduled to grow by 6 percent. The increase in outlays will surely outpace the growth of the economy in 2000. In absolute and relative terms, government is not shrinking but growing.

But this raises the question: By how much? And compared with what? In judging the Republican performance, it's only fair to take account of political reality—in particular, the terra incognita of budgeting in an era of surplus.

A better term for Bill Clinton's "Third Way" governing philosophy might be "balanced-budget liberalism." For years, Republicans ran against the federal budget deficit, while Democrats only paid lip service to the concept (though they were always prepared to raise taxes in the name of deficit reduction). With their new majority after the 1994 elections, Republicans felt obliged to attack the deficit head-on. Politically, they ran into the Clintonian buzzsaw. But in the end, thanks in no small measure to a surging economy, Clinton was happy to grant Republicans what they had always claimed was their fondest wish: a balanced federal budget.

One should, of course, be careful what one wishes for, lest one get it. Before Republicans saw it, Clinton understood the political implications of a world of budget surpluses. If your main argument against federal spending is "the deficit," then surpluses translate into more spending. The GOP leadership on Capitol Hill disagreed. Many of them still wanted to cut spending or at least restrain increases. But for the first time in their political lives, the budget deficit was no longer at hand as an easy argument against spending. And Clinton would not go along with a tax cut acceptable to Republicans, so no budget restraint would be imposed by depriving the government of tax revenue.

This is the box Republicans found themselves in at the beginning of the 1999 budget season, with the additional headache, after their 1998 election losses, of only a whisker-thin majority in the House. What's more, impeachment-related political tumult had claimed first the Gingrich speakership and then Bob Livingston's, resulting in the elevation of the amiable but untested Dennis Hastert of Illinois. This looked for all the world like an environment in which Clinton could fragment the House Republicans and dictate the spending levels he wanted, up to the limits of the budget surplus.

Indeed, this was the calculation the House leadership made at first. They were inclined to abandon the budget caps early and make an expensive peace with the White House, thereby avoiding the nightmare scenario of another government shutdown for which they would be blamed—and the end of their majority in 2000. But there was serious resistance in the ranks to the idea of popping the caps. So they hung on and looked for some other survival kit, and found an unlikely one.

They decided to make Social Security their friend. For years, the fact that government took in more in Social Security taxes than it paid in benefits, \$99 billion in 1998, was irrelevant to the big picture on the deficit. In other words, government "spent" the Social Security "surplus"—that is, the deficit for running the rest of the government, apart from Social Security, would have been higher by the amount of the Social Security surplus. No one seriously objected to this "raid" on the "Social Security trust fund." These are arbitrary accounting distinctions.

Then, in a series of head-scratching staff meetings devoted to the question of how not to get killed, Republicans finally hit paydirt—a line they could articulate simply and clearly, with potential for public resonance, and around which they could keep their slender majority united, against all odds. It was "Stop the Raid" on Social Security. At a stroke, they were able to declare some \$147 billion of the federal budget surplus for 2000 off limits to new spending. And they were able to hold that line.

In accounting reality, this Social Security surplus figure is not less arbitrary than the budget caps supposedly still in force. But in the real world of politics, the fact is that budget caps were too abstract to hold Republicans together. Social Security is real. Clinton's rhetorical case against a tax cut hinged on protecting Social Security, for example.

Without necessarily setting out to do so, the GOP leadership essentially created a very useful artificial deficit, the size of the Social Security surplus. This "deficit" now serves as a restraint on federal spending—and will continue to do so. The Social Security surplus is estimated at about \$155 billion in fiscal 2001 and \$164 billion the year after. If Republicans win this point, it's likely to work for them in future budget rounds.

The story of the fiscal 2000 budget, then, is not the story of gimmicks and gewgaws. That's the story of the budget every year. The story is how a perilously thin and nervous GOP majority under an untested leader managed to change the subject in such a way as to forestall scores of billions in additional government spending at a time when the government had the money. Dennis Hastert turns out to be the most underestimated politician in Washington since Bill Clinton in January 1995.

HONORING JUNE HOROVITZ

HON. ROBIN HAYES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 4, 1999

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a legislative hawk from North Carolina who is going to be moving out of our state in just a few days. June Horovitz from Raleigh, has worked hard for the people of North Carolina. Although she has never been elected and she has never been paid a lobbying fee, she has worked for over 17 years to make North Carolina a better place.

I first met June in 1992 as a state legislator in North Carolina's General Assembly. June does not drive, so she would ride the bus or catch a ride with a friend down to the legislature building and attend committee meetings and visit with members. We became fast friends due to her hard work to eliminate the state sales tax on food. June's cause prevailed. Last year, the General Assembly repealed the final two cents of the state's portion of the food tax.

Since moving on, June has kept me informed of the issues in the North Carolina General Assembly. June is moving to Boca Raton, Florida on Thursday, November 18 to be closer to her brother and his family. I expect she will continue to fight high taxes and wasteful government in her new state of residence. I thank her for all her support and wish her all the best.